

MEMORANDUM

TO: ALLEN BOGARD, CITY MANAGER *QB*

VIA: PAUL A. HOFMANN, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER *PH*

FROM: SABINE KUENZEL, AICP, CITY PLANNER *AK*

DATE: OCTOBER 22, 2003

SUBJECT: LAND USE PLAN PUBLIC INPUT MEETINGS

Last month, the Long Range Planning division conducted four target area meetings for the Land Use Plan. Seven areas were identified to focus our land use planning efforts – each will eventually require City Council policy direction during the adoption process. We solicited input on five of the seven areas. The input we received will be incorporated into the text, and will be considered as staff formulates scenarios and recommendations. I am briefly summarizing the meetings as follows:

September 11th at 6:00 pm (covering Area 5 – TXDOT Tract 3) – No members of the public attended the meeting.

September 17th at 4:00 pm (covering Areas 1 and 2 – the MUC District and the area between Wal-Mart and Memorial Herman Hospital). Seven attendees generally expressed an interest in a continuation of the current intent of the MUC district. We also received input that the infill area in and around the Planned Development District should allow general retail uses versus reserving all or a portion of the area for exclusively office uses.

September 18th at 6:00 pm (covering Area 3 - Fluor) – Eleven attendees, mostly residents, expressed an interest in a transition area on the Fluor property that would allow it to continue to build out with current uses, but that would keep periphery buildings low. In the past, the owners of the Fluor property had agreed with the neighboring residents to restrict building heights in certain areas across from Oyster Bay and Sugar Lakes. These residents requested that these agreements be formalized through any future PD amendments. Brookside/Belknap, and Hall Lake residents would like the same provisions in the areas across from these subdivisions. There was also concern about possible increased drainage problems and an increase in traffic accessing Sugar Lakes Drive.

September 24th at 6:00 pm (covering Area 6 – the “window pane” area north of Riverstone) – five attendees, all residents in the Maranatha Subdivision. The property owner had recently provided input during an office visit. There was general agreement between the residents and the property owner that the area should be developed single family residential, and that smaller lot sizes, perhaps even townhomes, might be acceptable to make development of the constrained property more feasible. The residents expressed their acceptance of residential, but they would prefer the property be used as park land or not develop at all. The property

owner had proposed a small neighborhood commercial use at the intersection of Oilfield Road and a future east-west road to be located on the northernmost periphery of Riverstone. The residents were opposed to the commercial use. The attendees were concerned about the commercial uses already approved in the General Plan for Riverstone, and that a road would be built behind their tracts. The residents also expressed concern about the current condition of Oilfield Road, which is a substandard road, but is heavily used and is therefore deteriorating rapidly.

We also were invited to two additional speaking engagements – one with the Commonwealth Home Owners' Association Board, and one with the Sugar Creek Rotary Club. The Rotary Club had some general land use plan questions. The Commonwealth Board had some concerns regarding the Riverstone approved General Land Plan because it shows commercial uses south of Brazos Landing. However, the Board was generally in agreement with the Riverstone Plan, especially the improved circulation and access that it will afford once the project is built out. The Board expressed concern that the future intersection of Palm Royale and Commonwealth may be restricted. The preference is for a well-functioning intersection that provides adequate mobility.

There were two areas that have not yet received input. These are identified as Areas 4A, 4B, and 7. Area 7 is TXDot Tract 2, which is located west of the Sugar Land Regional Airport and currently has poor access with no thoroughfares planned at this time. Tract 2 should be placed in a holding category for future growth, and more detailed land use planning should be reserved for future Comprehensive Plan updates. The solicitation of public input is better reserved for that future time.

At the time we were preparing for the public input period, the City was not aware of any plans that the owners of the Imperial Sugar site may have had (Area 4B) to either exercise their rights under the Heavy Industrial zoning, or to abandon the historically M-2 zoned use of the property. Now that we have been made aware of the intention of the property owners to change the land uses on the site, it is appropriate for the City to discuss various land use options with the owners and to solicit public input, all through the Land Use Plan update process.

We are now to the point where we will work on filling in possible land use scenarios in the seven decision Areas. The scenarios will then be analyzed, and final recommendations will enter the public hearing and workshop process during the Spring 2004.